

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|------------------------------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/057,624 | 10/25/2001 | James G. Shelnut | 50455 | 2203 |
| 21874 7 | 590 04/05/2004 | | EXAM | INER |
| EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP | | | TALBOT, BRIAN K | |
| P.O. BOX 55874 BOSTON, MA 02205 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| BOSTON, MA | A 02203 | | 1762 | |

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Annication No. | Applicant(s) |
|--|--|---|
| | Application No. | |
| Office Action Summary | 10/057,624 | SHELNUT, JAMES G. Art Unit |
| Office Action Guillinary | Examiner Brian K Talbat | 1762 |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication ap | Brian K Talbot pears on the cover sheet with | |
| Period for Reply | , | · |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rep If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply oly within the statutory minimum of thirty (3 will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH ie. cause the application to become ABAN | y be timely filed 30) days will be considered timely. S from the mailing date of this communication. IDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). |
| Status | | |
| Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 M This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ Thi Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under | is action is non-final. ance except for formal matter | |
| Disposition of Claims | | |
| 4) Claim(s) 1-7 and 27-33 is/are pending in the a 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-7 and 27-33 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/ | awn from consideration. | · |
| Application Papers | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examina 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examination. | ccepted or b) objected to by e drawing(s) be held in abeyance ction is required if the drawing(s | e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri application from the International Bure. * See the attached detailed Office action for a list | nts have been received. nts have been received in Ap iority documents have been re au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | plication No eceived in this National Stage |
| Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/03) Paper No(s)/Mail Date | Paper No(s)/ | mmary (PTO-413) Mail Date ormal Patent Application (PTO-152) |

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 10/057,624

Art Unit: 1762

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

- 1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 3/15/04 has been entered.
- 2. Claims 8-26 and 34 have been canceled. Claims 1-7 and 27-33 remain in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-4,6,7,27-30,32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen (6,277,263) in combination with Rapoport et al. (5,298,687) further in combination with Applicant's admitted state of the art (specification, pg. 2).

Chen (6,277,263) teaches method for electrolytically depositing copper on a semiconductor. A copper bath is utilized to electroplate copper onto a seed layer or to enhance an ultra-thin copper seed layer, which has been deposited on a barrier layer by PVD. When used for seed layer enhancement, the resulting copper seed layer provides an excellent conformal copper coating that allows the microstructures to be filled with copper layer having good uniformity (see abstract). The substrate can have vias or trenches lined with a barrier layer.

Chen (6,277,263) fail to teach the use of a conductive polymer for the seed layer.

Art Unit: 1762

Rapoport et al. (5,298,687) teaches a multilayer interconnect system and method of manufacturing. Looking at figs. 1-2, a first metal seed layer (2) is applied to a substrate (1). Next a second seed layer (4) is applied to create a continuous seed layer prior to subsequent depositing. The seed layer is a conductive polymer (col. 3, lines 40-62).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chen (6,277,263) seed layer with the conductive polymer as evidenced by Rapoport et al. (5,298,687) with the expectation of achieving similar results, i.e. a conformal, continuous conductive coating.

Chen (6,277,263) in combination with Rapoport et al. (5,298,687) fail to teach the thickness of the conductive polymer seed layer being from 50-1500 angstroms

Applicant's admitted state of the art (specification, pg. 2), under the heading, background of the invention, details that it is known in the art to form seed layers with thicknesses from 50-1500 angstroms.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have applied the seed layer with a thickness in the claimed range as evidenced by Applicant's admitted state of the art (specification, pg. 2) with the expectation of achieving similar success. Furthermore, it is the Examiner's position that the thickness of a coating layer, in this case the seed layer, is a "result effective" variable which can be optimized by one skilled in the art depending upon the desired final product produced.

Claims 5 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen (6,277,263) in combination with Rapoport et al. (5,298,687) further in view of Applicant's

Art Unit: 1762

admitted state of the art (specification, pg. 2) still further in view of Jonas et al. (6,358,437 B1) and Cloots et al (6,340,496 B1).

Chen (6,277,263) in combination with Rapoport et al. (5,298,687) further in view of Applicant's admitted state of the art (specification, pg. 2) fails to teach the conductive polymer being an acetylene, aniline, pyrrole or thiopene.

Features described above are incorporated here.

Jonas et al. (6,358,437 B1) and Cloots et al (6,340,496 B1) both teach utilizing substituted conductive polythiophenes and polypyrroles for forming conductive coatings (abstract).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chen (6,277,263) in combination with Rapoport et al. (5,298,687) further in view of Applicant's admitted state of the art (specification, pg. 2) conductive polymer seed layer with Jonas et al. (6,358,437 B1) and Cloots et al (6,340,496 B1) conductive polymers of polythiophenes and polypyrroles with the expectation of achieving similar success.

Response to Amendment

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7 and 27-33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 1762

Applicant argued that Chen (6,277,263) teaches electroplating to "repair" the "seed layer" as opposed to using a conductive polymer as well as the conductive polymer of Rapoport et al. (5,298,687) being a "metal filled" polymer.

Applicant's arguments are not commensurate in scope with the claims. The claims are not limited to a conductive polymer which is not "filled with metal" as detailed in the prior art. If Applicant were to amendment the claims to recite the specific polymers and to recite that the polymers are not "filled" with metal particles as the "seed material", the Examiner will reconsider his position. However, the Examiner reserves the right to require further search or consideration for such amendments.

Applicant argued the clamed thickness was not taught.

Applicant's admitted state of the art (specification, pg. 2), under the heading, background of the invention, details that it is known in the art to form seed layers with thicknesses from 50-1500 angstroms.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian K Talbot whose telephone number is (703) 305-3775. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 6AM-3PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shrive P Beck can be reached on (703) 308-2333. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 1762

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3775.

Brian K Talbot Primary Examiner Art Unit 1762

B-KTaUT

BKT April 1, 2004